

APPROVED 4-03-03



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD  
KIVA - CITY HALL  
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD  
MARCH 20, 2003  
MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Wayne Ecton, Councilman  
E.L. Cortez, Vice Chairman  
Steve Steinberg, Planning Commission Member  
Anne Gale, Design Member  
Raymond Potter, Design Member  
Michael Schmitt, Design Member  
Mark Soden, Design Member

**STAFF:** Tim Conner  
Tim Curtis  
Keith Niederer  
Jayna Shewak  
Bill Verschuren  
Al Ward  
Bob Wood

**CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Ecton at 1:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

**OPENING STATEMENT**

**COUNCILMAN ECTON** read the opening statement that describes the role of the Development Review Board and the procedures used in conducting this meeting.

APPROVED 4-03-03 - BDF

## **MINUTES APPROVAL**

March 06, 2003 Development Review Board Minutes

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MARCH 6, 2003 MINUTES AS PRESENTED. SECOND BY MR. SCHMITT.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

## **CONTINUANCES**

65-DR-2002                      Design Guidelines for Office Development  
   City-Wide  
   City of Scottsdale, Applicant  
   **CONTINUED TO APRIL 03, 2003**

**COUNCILMAN ECTON** stated case 15-DR-2003 would be moved from the consent to the regular agenda.

**MS. SHEWAK** announced it was Mr. Soden's last meeting. She stated he has served on the Board for six years. She presented him with a gift of appreciation for his service.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

46-DR-2002#2                      Cornwell Properties @ Scottsdale Road  
   Site Plan and Elevations  
   14851 N. Scottsdale Road  
   Knoell & Quidort Architects,  
   Architect/Designer

3-PP-2003                         DC Ranch Parcel 1.13  
   Preliminary Plat  
   Wood Patel, Engineers

4-PP-2003                         DC Ranch Parcel 1.17  
   Preliminary Plan  
   Wood Patel, Engineers

**MR. CURTIS** presented cases 3-PP-2003 and 4-PP-2203 as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval subject, to the attached stipulations.

**COUNCILMAN ECTON** stated he has looked at the sites very closely. He further stated it certainly is not their job to tell the developer what they should be

doing on this particular site but this is a very delicate site in terms of where the airport is located. He remarked he thought they are taking steps to make sure anyone who purchases in that area knows an airport is there and that will be in the deed and in proper notifications. However, all of that does not ensure people will not complaint about the air traffic and the developer needs to understand that. It is not in their power to say whether they can do it or not do it but it is information the developer and the public needs to know.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASES 46-DR-2002#2, 3-PP-2003 AND 4-PP-2003. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER POTTER.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

**REGULAR AGENDA**

15-DR-2003                      Active Body Store  
   Site Plan & Elevations  
   10830 N. Scottsdale Road  
   Delorme & Associates,  
   Architect/Designer

**MR. NIEDERER** presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

**COUNCILMAN ECTON** inquired if it was a stand alone building or attached to the rest of the complex. Mr. Niederer replied it would be attached to the original building to the west. Councilman Ecton inquired if the original building was like that. Mr. Niederer replied in the affirmative.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ** stated there were questions raised in the study session regarding the overall design solution that was presented namely the design direction that this a end cap building and its relationship to the existing architecture of that complex. One of the Board members mentioned the fact they should head in the direction of trying to match or replicate that existing condition. He further stated that he believed the solution that has been presented is very nice, but if they have an applicant in that center that comes before the Board and submits an application to the staff that is immediately adjacent to this new design concept, what direction are they prepared to give to that applicant based on the solutions presented today. He remarked his concern is whether they are prepared to head in a direction that is very similar to this solution that has been presented today. If everyone is comfortable with that than he has no problem but he wants to make sure they give some thought to the design guidelines for this particular center.

**MR. CONNER** stated the issues Vice Chairman Cortez raised are exactly what staff struggled with and it is one should they tie a solution down to the older idiom when modernization maybe a better solution because of function and other things. He further stated they looked at the surrounding context and some of the things they can look to are things that are done in a consistent manner. He noted if in the future someone continues to take on the new design theme they would look for some of the key components in this design for consistency.

**MR. STEINBERG** stated where the new project meets the existing project is very weak. There does not seem to be a transition necessary to break the architecture. It is kind of bland the way this meets the existing.

Mr. Steinberg stated he felt the height of the base underneath the display windows seems excessive and raises the pedestrian scale. He further stated in his opinion it upsets the pedestrian scale.

**COUNCILMAN ECTON** stated what they are looking at does set precedence for this center. He further stated he is very familiar with this center. He remarked from what he sees on this particular project it does change the face of the center. He further remarked he is not saying that he does not like it, but is this what they want to do. Do they want set a standard to go by for the future as other businesses decide to get involved in updating? He noted in some cases they are required to maintain the character that is there and this is clearly a departure from the character of this center. They needed to determine if this is the direction they want to go.

**MR. CONNER** stated perhaps this is an area there might be a need to focus on for some new design guidelines. It is a smaller sub-area that has a unique character and they need to determine what characteristics they would like to retain or enhance.

**COUNCILMAN ECTON** stated this particular area has a unique character. It is very significant. It is not a small area. It is much larger than most they see around. He further stated he has been involved with other centers around the city where they insist that they maintain the character and don't change a lot so he felt it might be an issue.

**MR. SCHMITT** inquired if these buildings are owned separately rather than an assembled property. Mr. Conner replied in the affirmative. Mr. Schmitt stated he felt Vice Chairman Cortez brings up a cogent point with respect to this project. This property appears to be two city blocks in size. Although it is a shopping center it is much larger than a shopping center, it is more like a village and so maybe what happens on this corner is that this style will drive the rest of the buildings and carry forward. He further stated one thing he not want does to see is something that will stifle revitalizing this area because some of the buildings

are dated and older. He remarked he likes the idea of pumping life into this center. He further remarked he does not see it as the same thing all the way around. That being said he likes the direction it has gone. He noted he would agree with Commissioner Steinberg about the connection to the adjacent building could be improved.

**MS. GALE** stated what some of the Board members are struggling with is that this is half a building that is being renovated. It would be unfortunate to limit the bringing of the retail center into a more desirable stylistic presentation because it does not fit what was there exactly. She further stated she felt the strongest criticism is that the connection to the oldest building was weak and she felt that could be dealt with at the staff level. She concluded she supports this building.

**MR. SODEN** stated overall he does not have a problem with the new materials and the overall design of the building as it relates to the existing buildings. He further stated he felt what needed some revision was the stepping of the parapet heights of the building. The one that seems the most out of place is on the east elevation and should be lowered.

**AMBER ROTH**, DeLorme & Associates, architect, stated one of the things they are trying to do with the elevations is to provide a little bit of animation while staying true to the neighboring context. She further stated with regard to the comment of lowering the parapet on the east side they felt it would look to balanced. They are trying to have a sense of hierarchy over the entrance and then stepping down to the neighboring development at Sundown Plaza.

**MR. SODEN** inquired if the applicant thinks it makes sense to have the highest piece over the main entry because that is not what they have. Ms. Roth stated she just does not think the two have to be at the same height. Mr. Soden inquired if it could be stepped down a little bit on the east side. Ms. Roth stated they could agree to lower it to 22 feet. She further stated the other issue they have with the east elevation on Scottsdale Road is with signage and the fact that they need a place that really calls their attention so that is why they are having the higher wall on the north end of the site with signage. Mr. Soden stated if they are just raising it up to put a sign on it is not a good enough reason. It should be at the height so that it looks right.

**COUNCILMAN ECTON** stated there will be an entire wall there to put the sign on and it will be seen where ever you put it. He further stated he likes the idea that it stair steps to the west and it would look good where they step down as they are going the other way. Ms. Roth inquired if they are suggesting they lower the east side to 22 feet the same as the height over the entry. They would agree to that. Councilman Ecton replied he thought Mr. Soden was suggesting it stair step down in the same logical fashion as it stair stepped down back to the west.

**JEPH DELORME**, Delorme & Associates, stated to consider the question relative to the east wall it would be easiest to look at the picture in the packet that shows Cactus Flower on the opposing corner that is also a very tall structure. He further stated it would be acceptable to drop the signage portion on the east wall down to the same height of the building and would keep the character of the building they are trying to create.

**MR. STEINBERG** stated he felt this is an important corner to this area. He further stated he is hoping in the future it redevelops as a beautiful pedestrian oriented shopping experience. He commented his only concern is that he does not see any historical reference in the architecture. Mr. Delorme stated he cannot comment because a historical reference was never part of any of their discussions with staff. Mr. Steinberg stated he is being personally sensitive because this is an important corner and a building block in this redevelopment corner.

**MS. GALE** stated she would like the Board to remember that six months ago they approved London Gold, which is a development not a block away and this building is very congenial with that if you are looking at neighborhood context. This building fits what they felt was appropriate at that corner.

**MR. SODEN** stated he felt the Board should give the applicant some clear direction regarding introducing some historical elements. He further stated he felt it might be as simple as working with staff to review some of the materials and colors.

**MS. GALE** stated she felt if they changed the aluminum to a darker core tin steel might get them to a warmer historical context.

**MR. STEINBERG** stated his issue speaks more to architecture rather than cosmetically treating it with colors.

**MR. POTTER** stated he always has a difficult time when they get to this point for several reasons. They obviously do not have a character study done for Sundown Plaza. Yet it has a character that was established in the late '60's or early '70's and the center is a bit dated. This also being an end cap being on Scottsdale Road they might want to start integrating something new. They may want to start encouraging the evolution of the plaza in a new way. As the applicant has pointed out Cactus Flower has already done that. So he has mixed emotions about asking these folks to create major changes in their design when they as a community, as a planning force don't have a real creative solution for them. He remarked that he is satisfied with the design that it is a creative move forward and not a move backward in the area.

**MR. CORTEZ** inquired if the applicant would respond to a stipulation that the highest parapet be lowered to no taller than 17 feet 10 inches. Mr. Delorme stated they would not want to lower it below 22 foot 3 inches.

Mr. Cortez stated on the north side of the elevation they typically recommend as a Board to have a plane differentiation of the two materials.

**MR. SCHMITT MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 15-DR-2003 WITH THE STIPULATIONS PRESENTED BY STAFF AND WITH THE FOLLOWING ADDED STIPULATIONS:**

- **THEY RESTUDY THE TRANSITION BETWEEN THE NEW BUILDING AND THE EXISTING BUILDING. THAT CAN BE HANDLED AT THE STAFF LEVEL.**
- **ADD A HORIZONTAL OFFSET BETWEEN THE TRAVERTINE TILE AND STUCCO BAND ON THE BOTTOM IN ORDER TO STRENGTHEN THE BUILDING'S BASE. THAT CAN BE HANDLED AT THE STAFF LEVEL.**

**SECOND BY MS. GALE.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ONE (1) WITH MR. STEINBERG DISSENTING.**

16-DR-2003

Loloma 5  
Site Plan and Elevations  
3707 N. Marshall Way  
Will Bruder Architects, Architect/Designer

**MR. VERSCHUREN** presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval subject to the attached stipulations.

**WILL BRUDER**, Will Bruder Architects, stated the project is a design that reflects on Scottsdale's heritage of contemporary design. He further stated the building has been certified with the green building status. He reported they have continued the dialogue with the neighboring property owners and they have received support. The design is a contemporary interpretation of Scottsdale's western heritage.

(COUNCILMAN ECTON OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

**NORWOOD SISSON**, 7431 E. Portland, stated the storm water drainage in this City is woefully inadequate as far as the 100-year storm. He further stated he would like to know what provisions have been made for storm water detention on

this site. He remarked he does not like the shiny metal they are proposing to use.

(COUNCILMAN ECTON CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

**MR. BRUDER** stated the City Engineer found it unnecessary to provide on-site water retention. It meets all of the criteria for the downtown plan. He further stated with regard to the shiny material it will be weather steel and all of those elements will not be reflective.

**MR. STEINBERG** stated he loves in fill projects of this caliber. This is something they would find in any great city. It looks like a great exciting project.

**MR. SCHMITT** stated with regard to the citizens comment regarding the shiny material that the metal on the roof might be considered shiny. Mr. Bruder stated it would only be shiny during the first two months of construction.

**MR. STEINBERG MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 16-DR-2003. SECOND BY VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

94-DR-2000#2	Miller Crossing
	Site Plan & Elevations
	SEC Miller Road & Roosevelt
	Linderoth Associates, Architect/Designer

**MR. WARD** presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

(COUNCILMAN ECTON OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

**NORWOOD SISSON**, 7431 E. Portland, stated he is happy to see the colors have been changed. He further stated as far as storm water drainage this site does not need storm water drainage because the Indian Bend Wash provides drainage. He remarked there are Federal laws that require storm water drainage and the City Policy may neglect the Federal laws but that is not a wise thing to do.

(COUNCILMAN ECTON CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

**MR. WARD** stated as mentioned by the speaker this will have run off to Indian Bend Wash and does meet all of the City and Federal standards.



**LARRY KUSH**, 9060 N. 106<sup>th</sup> Place, provided a brief history on his experience in building homes in the City of Scottsdale. He reported this site received DR approval in 2000, however, the approval expired. They are requesting re-approval without change from the previous application. The only change that has been made is to the colors of the buildings. He further reported they have agreed to dedicate the eastern 100-ft. of the site for a City parking lot for the adjacent ballfield and park.

**MS GALE** stated she felt the colors that were originally presented were delightful. She inquired if they would be willing to revisit the color palette. Mr. Kush stated they will come back with another color palette.

**MR. POTTER** stated this is a fine project. He inquired if the lights on the ballfield are oriented so they do not provide spillage into the lots on the south side. Mr. Kush stated he has been out there at night and it is not great but it is not awful. He further stated the Arizona Real Estate Report requires that you fully disclose things such as ballfields and they would be required to read and sign.

**MR. STEINBERG MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 94-DR-2000#2 WITH THE STIPULATION THE COLOR PALETTE RETURN TO A STUDY SESSION FOR BOARD REVIEW AND STAFF APPROVAL. SECOND BY VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

5-PP-2003                      Desert Estates @ Pinnacle Peak East  
Preliminary plat  
SEC of 132<sup>nd</sup> Street & Dynamite  
Geo Dimensions, Engineers

**MR. WARD** presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval subject, to the attached stipulations.

**TOM RIEF**, Land Development Services, 4413 N. Saddlebag Trail, stated staff has provided a relatively accurate description of their proposal. He further stated they are asking for approval of a preliminary plat for an 80-lot subdivision on a 160-acre parcel. He reported they have worked very openly with the neighborhood and have had neighborhood meetings and continued dialogue with them. He concluded they have reviewed all of the stipulations and would request the Board's approval.

(COUNCILMAN ECTON OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

**NEVA HENRY**, 27411 N. 152<sup>nd</sup> Street, spoke in opposition to this request. She stated she is President of the Rio Verde Horseman's Association. She further

reported since 1999 she has worked with the Maricopa County Flood Control because of the flooding issues they have on 136<sup>th</sup> Street. She commented they have real strict guidelines in there because of the flooding problems. She provided a brief overview of her concerns that relate to flooding problems. She concluded this is the last bit of open space and they would like to keep it rural and less dense. They would also like to ensure they have horse privileges on the trails.

**MARGARET DALEO**, 26805 N. 136<sup>th</sup> Street, spoke in opposition to this request. She stated her address is actually in the county but her 10 acres abuts Scottsdale. She further stated she is very familiar with these washes and how much water flows through these washes. She remarked she felt the density was too high for this piece of property. It needs to come down. It needs to conform to the desert. She further remarked there are some very beautiful rock outcroppings and she would hate to see someone blade it just to put in houses. She commented if you ride the trails system on Dynamite you are taking your life into your own hands because of the traffic. She added she felt this area should stay rural. She further added this property should be developed properly and not just put in a ton of houses and rip up the desert.

**SAM WEST**, 8160 N. Hayden Road, Suite J-210, spoke in opposition to this request. He stated he owns property up off of 142<sup>nd</sup> and Dove Valley that is four or five miles north of this project. He further stated he did not receive a copy of these stipulations until yesterday and he spend several hours going through them and he has numerous issues. He remarked because of his concerns he felt this should be send back for more work. He further remarked he has concerns regarding the wall design stipulations because it is in conflict with the rural character and the walls destroy the natural flow of water.

Ms. West stated he also has concerns regarding the lighting stipulations because it is in conflict with the area. He further stated the cuts and fill issues have not been addressed.

Mr. West stated they need to address the issue of protection of existing vegetation. He further stated in only two places is re-vegetation specifically addressed. The only statement he could find that addressed re-vegetation pertains to trees and shrubs it states nothing about ground cover. He commented he does not think this issue has been adequately addressed in the stipulations.

Mr. West stated last Monday he was in the desert in the rain and he was standing on the fence line and on the east side it was bladed and the west side it was substantially natural desert vegetation. On the fence line, where there was vegetation and ground cover there was no visible sheet flow of water. Where it was bladed, you could see the water sheet flowing across the desert.

Mr. West stated the Maricopa County Flood Control has made the statement that the Rio Verde drainage shed is unique. They need to address the issue of erosion.

Mr. West stated he provided the Board with a copy of a letter from Howard Meyers that addresses these same issues.

Mr. West provided an overview of his calculations for the square footage of the hard surface for this project.

Mr. West noted that conceptually the drainage plan has not been approved. He further noted there are additional questions regarding drainage that need to be answered before this can be approved.

(COUNCILMAN ECTON CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

Mr. Rief stated they have had extensive dialogue with the neighboring property owners and residents. Unfortunately, this is the first time Ms. Henry has provided them any feedback. He further stated with regard to the flooding issues in this area they have had open dialogue and meetings with Maricopa County Flood Control District and they have reviewed the flood control drainage plans and they have not raised any issues or concerns related to drainage.

Mr. Rief stated from a density standpoint they are not developing under the existing entitlements. The existing ordinance allows for a density of 88 units and they have plans for only 80 units. The plan has 94 acres of open space. As far as blading everything, that is not their intention. He noted with regard to the trail a members of the Parks Department could respond to any of their concerns.

Mr. Rief stated they would love not to have to pave roads but it is their understanding that is a requirement of the Transportation Department. He further stated they would not have continuous perimeter walls. The proposal for interior lighting is for safety and circulation areas. He added with regard to re-vegetation and erosion he would refer to staff to explain their position.

**MR. SCHMITT** stated the speaker indicated that the re-vegetation ordinance only requires the applicant to replace trees and shrubs in an area that has been disturbed. He inquired if a provision could be added that they include ground cover or something to restore the ground surface vegetation. Ms. Shewak provided information on the methodology that the city uses to determine how the re-vegetation plan will be implemented. She also provided information on how erosion is implemented into the re-vegetation plan. She stated the application before the Commission today is one of the many steps they have in front of them regarding this issue.

Mr. Schmitt inquired if there was anyway for the City of Scottsdale engineering staff to work with County in coordinating how the water runs off the city property and travels downstream. Mr. Ward stated it would be a coordinated effort.

Mr. Schmitt stated Mr. Rief was at the last session and they had a similar plan where it was recommended that the trail go through the wash and he did not see a stipulation requiring that in this case. He inquired if the Parks staff saw different needs here than perhaps the other property. Gary Myers, Parks Trail Planning, stated this property has significant trails along the north and east boundaries along Dynamite and 136<sup>th</sup> Street. The Trails Master Plan shows the trails in this area and does not show them in the wash. He further stated with regard to the safety issue they felt the buffering from the roadway was sufficient to make this a safe trail. Ms. Shewak stated with regard to the comparison to the trail situation in this case and the previous case it is a very different scenario.

**MR. STEINBERG** stated his concern is regarding what happens downstream from this project and how that would effect the ranches to the south and southeast. He inquired if the City has a master drainage plan. Ms. Shewak replied the City of Scottsdale does undertake a master planning effort when considering drainage. Their master planning efforts go more towards mapping. They do map major washes. Mr. Steinberg stated he wants to reiterate that he has concerns regarding the effect this project will have on the properties downstream because a lot of the pads are being built on the natural washes which is a concern they need to look at. He added he would hesitate to recommend approval without further study.

**DAVID LOGAN**, civil engineer, GEO Dimensions, 3030 E. Camelback Road, Phoenix, AZ, discussed the issues that have been raised regarding drainage on this site. He reviewed the drainage waiver process. He discussed the drainage study that was done on this project. He noted that every drainage basin is unique and needs to be treated that way. He also noted that generally the City of Scottsdale requirements are more stringent than a lot of other greater Phoenix areas. He presented information on the location of the box culverts.

**MR. SODEN** asked a series of questions regarding the drainage on the site. He commented that it seemed strange that they were approving something that is subject to change. Mr. Logan provided additional information on the drainage for this site and the issues that need to be worked out. Mr. Soden stated it seems there are a lot of unknowns at this point that relate to drainage and he is not sure why they would move it forward with so many changes pending. Mr. Rief stated they would acknowledge that they have a lot of drainage work to do and there is still a lot of study that needs to be done and it will take months to work out all of the details. He remarked they are asking for approval.

Mr. Soden stated he would agree with the stipulation that the applicant should use the most current information available as it relates to the 2000 FEMA report.

Mr. Soden inquired how the applicant justifies the amended development standards. Mr. Rief stated the project narrative goes into detail regarding the justification for the amended development standards. He provided a brief overview of what they are providing to justify the amended development standards.

Mr. Soden stated it would be useful to get more information on the lighting plan and an additional stipulation might be necessary to minimize the impact of the lighting.

**MR. POTTER** stated he would agree with Mr. Soden regarding the applicant using the most current FEMA maps. He further stated he would encourage them to seek out the latest information because this area is changing.

Mr. Potter stated he is also concerned about the impact that will occur downstream. Mr. Logan stated they have been working with staff to address these types of issues and they expect the impacts to be acceptable.

**MS. GALE** inquired if it would be possible to spend a little more time on this and allow the engineer to answer the citizens concerns. Ms. Shewak stated that is possible but she is not sure if the engineer would be interested in getting into a dialogue at this point. It would be appropriate to respond to any issues but she is not sure what type of dialogue they would be interested in at this point.

**COUNCILMAN ECTON** stated this is a very unique piece of property and it is a very unique area. He further stated he has walked properties in this area. He remarked he is very uncomfortable with the drainage issues. There are issues that need to be addressed. This plat looks like a disaster waiting to happen. There are many variables that impact this property. He noted he would feel uncomfortable approving this case because they do not have enough information to move ahead. He stated he would request an additional study session. He further noted he is not opposed to the development of this property but they need a better understanding of how the outstanding issues will be solved. He would request delaying this request to allow them addition time to come up with solutions.

**MR. SCHMITT** stated that lots, 77, 78, and 79 are the lots that surround the boulder outcropping. It appears there may be something in the range of 10 feet of fill around the boulder outcroppings and a straight-line berm along the street to the east. He further stated they might want to have a more natural looking berm. Mr. Logan stated he would agree. He further stated this is a custom home project and each lot will be individually graded to match whatever home goes on

the property. City staff required them with the preliminary plat to show the contours as they are on there. They do not know how this will be graded. They do not think it is a good idea to grade a pad across those three lots when they do the infrastructure improvements on this lot that should be left up to the individual lots. Mr. Schmitt inquired how much fill would go around the boulder outcroppings. Mr. Logan stated he was not sure because they are custom lots. Mr. Schmitt stated he would encourage them to look at the engineering to ensure they save the natural boulder outcroppings.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ** inquired if this property is required to meet the ESLO 2 guidelines. Mr. Ward replied in the affirmative. Vice Chairman Cortez inquired if there have been field surveys done on the rock outcroppings regarding the demarcation line between developed and undeveloped property. Mr. Ward replied there has not been anything specifically done but the building height would be measure above natural grade.

**MR. STEINBERG MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 5-PP-2003 ALLOWING FOR PROPER STUDY TIME AND INPUT FROM THE NEIGHBORS AT A DRB STUDY SESSION, PRIOR TO RETURNING TO A FUTURE DRB REGULAR AGENDA ITEM. SECOND BY VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ.**

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

(COUNCILMAN ECTON CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

### **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was adjourned at 3:52 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

"For the Record" Court Reporters